

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-20 are pending. Claims 5, 6, 9 and 11 are withdrawn. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 17-20 have been added; however, no new matter has been presented.

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight, U.S. Patent No. 5,825,436, in view of Eichenlaub, U.S. Patent No. 6,157,424. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a resin layer “not serving as a liquid crystal layer” formed in the light-transmitting part. The Examiner asserts that Knight’s layer 82 corresponds to the claimed resin layer. However, since Knight’s layers 82 are actually liquid crystal layers, they can not be a resin layer which does not serve as a liquid crystal layer. Thus, Knight in combination with Eichenlaub fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 1.

Claim 7 is allowable at least due to its dependency from claim 1. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakata, U.S. Patent No. 4,729,640, in view of Eichenlaub. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sakata’s device uses light diffraction, and has a configuration in which light incident on the device is split into light of 0th or high-order diffraction. In contrast, page 5, lines 5-9; and page 5, line 15 - page 7, line 6, for example, of the present specification show that the polarization state of light passing through the liquid crystal layer is changed so as to control light transmission or light blockage in the liquid crystal region, to form a barrier light-shielding part in the liquid crystal region, and to form a light-transmitting part in the transparent resin region.

Claim 1 has been amended in accordance with this disclosure. Since Sakata’s device uses light

diffraction, Sakata fails to teach or suggest the newly recited features of claim 1. Eichenlaub fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sakata.

The remaining claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies.

Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of Eichenlaub, and further in view of Sakata. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 10 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 3 and 10.

Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of Eichenlaub (or Sakata in view of Eichenlaub) and further in view of Baek, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0004687. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 is allowable at least due to its dependency from claim 1. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of claim 4. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 12-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of Eichenlaub and further in view of Akins, U.S. Patent No. 6,842,170. Claims 12-16 also stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakata in view of Eichenlaub and further in view of Lipton, U.S. Patent No. 5,686,975. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

These claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of the rejected claims. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Newly added claims 17-20 claims are allowable for the same reasons claim 1 is allowable. The cited art fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 17. Claims 18-20 are allowable at least due to their dependency from claim 17.

In view of the foregoing remarks, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this application, or deem that any formalities need to be addressed prior to allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the phone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Deborah S. Gladstein/
Deborah S. Gladstein
Reg. No. 43,636

DSG:nd
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100